

REMARKS

Claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14 – 17 and 20 are pending.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating “providing the requested karaoke content to a plurality of local karaoke units.” It is believed the amendment to Figure 6 and the specification overcome this rejection. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating “using a content mirror site.” It is believed the amendment to Figure 5 to include a missing reference number 118 for the content mirror site shown in that figure overcomes this objection. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating “performing an operation to transfer information.” Claim 5 which recited this limitation has been cancelled.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating a “control process.” Claim 13 which recited this limitation has been cancelled.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating a “karaoke module.” The objection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that karaoke module 164 of Figure 8B illustrates “a karaoke module.”

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not illustrating “the remote karaoke unit.” Claim 18 which recited this limitation has been cancelled.

The specification has been amended at the suggestion of the Examiner regarding cross references to related applications. The specification has also been amended to more clearly illustrate “providing the requested karaoke content to a plurality of local karaoke units.” No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from Claim 1 and is believed to be sufficiently definite as amended.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 5 and 6. These sheets, which include Figures 5 and 6, replace the original sheets including Figures 5 and 6. No new material has been added.

Figure 5 has been amended to add missing reference number 118 to the content server mirror site.

Figure 6 has been amended at the suggestion of the Examiner to more clearly illustrate “providing the requested karaoke content to a plurality of local karaoke units.” Step 142 as amended recites “download to requesting PC(s).”

Attachment: Replacement Sheets - TWO

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on February 28, 2005 between the Examiner, William James and Laura Ing. The Office Action mailed on January 25, 2005 was discussed. Specifically, the objections to the drawings were discussed with the intent to place the application in better condition for allowance. The Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner is fully accurate except to the extent it states that Applicants indicated that claims 7 and 11 would be amended and the rest of the claims cancelled. In fact, claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, and 19 have been canceled, with the limitations of claim 7 being incorporated into independent method claim 1 and the limitations of claim 11 being incorporated into independent system claim 9. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time and attention in this case.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The above-noted amendment to Figure 6 and accompanying text with respect to the recited “providing the requested karaoke content to a plurality of local karaoke units” is believed to overcome the rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. It is believed the above-noted amendment to Figure 5 regarding the recited “content mirror site” overcomes the rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 8 has been cancelled and independent computer program Claim 20 has been added. Claim 20 is believed to clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the meaning of the recited “karaoke module” is made clear in the specification including without limitation in Figure 8B (karaoke module 164).

The Examiner has indicated that Claim 7 contains allowable subject matter. Independent Claim 1 has been amended in a manner that is intended to include all of the limitations of Claim 7 as well as Claim 1, from which Claim 7 formerly depended. It is therefore believed that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2 – 4 and 6 depend from Claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable.

The Examiner has indicated that Claim 11 contains allowable subject matter. Independent Claim 9 has been amended in a manner that is intended to include all of the limitations of Claim 11 as well as Claim 9, from which Claim 11 formerly depended. It is therefore believed that Claim 9 is allowable. Claims 10, 12 and 14 – 17 depend from Claim 9 and are also believed to be allowable.

Claim 20 recites an independent computer program that performs the method of Claim 1. Claim 20 is therefore also believed to be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP

Dated: 3/11/05

William J. James
William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014